arXiv:1302.6039v1 [math.CO] 25 Feb 2013

Sperner's problem for G-independent families

Victor Falgas-Ravry*

February 26, 2013

Abstract

Given a graph G, let $Q(G)$ denote the collection of all independent (edge-free) sets of vertices in G. We consider the problem of determining the size of a largest antichain in $Q(G)$.

When G is the edge-less graph, this problem is resolved by Sperner's Theorem. In this paper, we focus on the case where G is the path of length $n-1$, proving the size of a maximal antichain is of the same order as the size of a largest layer of $Q(G)$.

Our results also apply in a more general situation when G is e.g. the cycle of length n or a typical instance of the Erdős–Rényi random graph $G_{n,p}$.

1 Introduction

1.1 The G-independent hypercube: definition and motivation

Let $n \in \mathbb{N}$ and let $G = (V, E)$ be a graph on $V(G) = [n] = \{1, 2 \dots\ n\}$.

Definition 1. A subset $A \subseteq [n]$ is *G-independent* if A is an edge-free set of vertices in G. The *G-independent* hypercube $Q(G) = Q_n(G)$ is the collection of all G-independent subsets of $[n]$.

G-independent hypercubes will be our main object of study in this paper. By definition, the G-independent hypercube is a subset of the n-dimensional hypercube Q_n. Indeed if G is the graph with no edges, then $Q(G)$ is exactly Q_n.

In this paper, we will be particularly interested in $Q(G)$ when G is the path of length $n-1$, P_n, or the cycle of length n, C_n. These can be thought as the space of zero-one strings of length n with no consecutive ones (with winding round in the case of C_n). These are very natural combinatorial spaces, which have already appeared in a variety of contexts.

Considered as graphs, the G-independent hypercubes $Q(P_n)$ and $Q(C_n)$ have been studied as an efficient network topology in parallel computing [8, 9, 16]. In this setting, they are known as the *Fibonacci cube* and the *Lucas cube* respectively. Cohen, Fachini and Körner [2] gave bounds for the size of large antichains in $Q(P_n)$ in connection with skewincidence, a new class of problems lying halfway between intersection problems and capacity problems for graphs. Talbot [18] proved a direct analogue of the Erdős–Ko–Rado theorem [5] for the Lucas cube $Q(C_n)$:

---

*Institutionen för matematik och matematisk statistik, Umeå Universitet, 901 87 Umeå, Sweden. Supported by a postdoctoral grant from the Kempe foundation. Email: `victor.falgas-ravry@math.umu.se`

Definition 2. Let r be an integer with $0 \leq r \leq n$. The r^{th} *layer* of the G-independent hypercube, $Q^{(r)}(G)$, is the collection of all G-independent subsets of $[n]$ of size r.

Theorem 1 (Talbot)**.** *Let $\mathcal{A} \subseteq Q^{(r)}(C_n)$ be a family of pairwise intersecting sets, and let $\mathcal{A}^\star$ be the collection of C_n-independent r-sets containing* 1*. Then*

$$|\mathcal{A}| \leq |\mathcal{A}^\star|.$$

Talbot's proof used an ingenious cyclic compression argument and easily adapts to the $Q(P_n)$ setting as well. In this case, the study of $Q(C_n)$ was motivated by a conjecture of Holroyd and Johnson [7] on the independence number of a vertex-critical subset of the Kneser graph first identified by Schrijver [14].

1.2 Antichains and G-independent families

Our efforts in this paper are directed towards finding G-independent analogues of another classical combinatorial result in the hypercube, namely Sperner's theorem.

Definition 3. A subset of the hypercube $\mathcal{A} \subseteq Q_n$ is an *antichain* if for all $A, B \in \mathcal{A}$ with $A \neq B$, A is not a subset of B and B is not a subset of A.

How large an antichain can we find? Clearly for all integers r with $0 \leq r \leq n$, the r^{th} layer of Q_n is an antichain. So certainly we can find an antichain at least as large as the largest layer of Q_n, and a celebrated theorem of Sperner [15] asserts this is in fact the best we can do:

Theorem 2 (Sperner's Theorem)**.** *Let $n \in \mathbb{N}$, and $\mathcal{A} \subseteq Q_n$ be an antichain. Then*

$$|\mathcal{A}| \leq \max_r |Q_n^{(r)}| = \binom{n}{\lfloor n/2 \rfloor}.$$

We consider the following generalisation of Sperner's problem.

Problem 1. Let $n \in \mathbb{N}$, and let G be a graph on $[n]$. What is the maximum size of an antichain in $Q(G)$?

Write $s(G)$ for the maximum size of an antichain in $Q(G)$. We refer to $s(G)$ as the *width* of $Q(G)$. As in Sperner's theorem the size of a largest layer in $Q(G)$ gives us a lower bound on the width $s(G)$. However, $s(G)$ can be much larger.

Let us begin with a simple example to show $s(G)$ can be larger by a constant multiplicative factor. Let $m \in \mathbb{N}$, and let G be a complete $2^{2m} + 1$ partite graph with one part of size $4m$ and 2^{2m} parts of size $2m$. A set in G is independent if and only if it meets only one of the parts, so an antichain in $Q(G)$ is the disjoint union of a collection of antichains inside each of the parts of G. It is thus a corollary to Sperner's theorem that

$$\begin{aligned} s(G) &= \binom{4m}{2m} + 2^{2m}\binom{2m}{m} \\ &= \left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}} + \frac{1}{\sqrt{\pi}} + o(1)\right)\frac{2^{4m}}{\sqrt{m}}. \end{aligned}$$

(Using Stirling's approximation for the factorial.) On the other hand, the r^{th} layer of $Q(G)$ has size

$$|Q^{(r)}(G)| = \binom{4m}{r} + 2^{2m}\binom{2m}{r}.$$

Of the two summand on the right, the first has the same order as $s(G)$ only when r is close to $2m$ while the second has the same order as $s(G)$ only when r is close to m. Using Stirling's approximation again, we have that

$$\max_{0\leq r\leq 4m} |Q^{(r)}(G)| = \left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{\pi}} + o(1)\right)\frac{2^{4m}}{\sqrt{m}}$$

which is smaller than $s(G)$ by a multiplicative factor of $\frac{\sqrt{2}}{\sqrt{2}+1} + o(1)$.

Using the same idea with more parts, we can in fact manufacture graphs G where the largest layers are not even of the same order as a largest antichain. Consider the following construction: let $m \in \mathbb{N}$. Consider a complete T-partite graph G with

$$T = \sum_{i=0}^{m} 2^{2^m - 2^i},$$

and, for every integer i: $0 \leq i \leq m$, $2^{2^m-2^i}$ parts of size of 2^i. This graph G has

$$n = \sum_{i=0}^{m} 2^{2^m - 2^i + i}$$

vertices. (So n has order roughly 2^{2^m}.)

A set in G is independent if and only if it meets exactly one of the parts. Thus the problem of finding a largest antichain in $Q(G)$ is equivalent to first finding maximal antichains inside each of G's T parts, and then taking their disjoint union to form a largest antichain in $Q(G)$. Applying Sperner's theorem, we deduce

$$s(G) = \sum_{i=0}^{m} 2^{2^m-2^i}\binom{2^i}{2^{i-1}}.$$

By Stirling's formula, $\binom{2^i}{2^{i-1}}$ is of order $\frac{2^{2^i}}{\sqrt{i}}$, and $\sum_{i=1}^{m}\frac{1}{\sqrt{i}}$ is of order $\sqrt{m}$, so that $s(G)$ itself is of order $2^{2^m}\sqrt{m}$.

On the other hand, the layers of $Q(G)$ are much smaller: the size of the r^{th} layer oscillates between peaks which have order $\frac{2^{2^m}}{\sqrt{i}}$, one for each i with $0 \leq i \leq m$. These peaks occur when r is close to 2^{i-1}, and correspond to the largest layer for the parts of size 2^i. Close to the peak corresponding to i, the contribution from the parts of size 2^j for $j \neq i$ is negligible. It follows that

$$\begin{aligned}\max_{0\leq r\leq n} |Q^{(r)}(G)| &= O\left(2^{2^m}\right)\\ &= o\left(s(G)\right).\end{aligned}$$

In general $s(G)$ and $\max\{|Q^{(r)}(G)| : 0 \leq r \leq n\}$ need thus not even be of the same order.

Question 2. When is $s(G) = \max_{r\geq 0}\{|Q^{(r)}(G)|\}$?

A natural guess is that it is sufficient for most vertices in G to look more or less the same.

Definition 4. Let G be a graph. An *automorphism* of G is a bijection $\phi :\ V(G) \to V(G)$ such that ϕ maps edges to edges and non-edges to non-edges. A graph is *vertex transitive* if for every $x, y \in V(G)$ there exists an automorphism of G mapping x to y.

Conjecture 3. Let G be a vertex-transitive graph. Then

$$s(G) = \max_{r\geq 0}\{|Q^{(r)}(G)|\}.$$

Of course, there is no reason however to believe that vertex-transitivity is a necessary condition for the width of $Q(G)$ to coincide with the size of the largest layer. Indeed consider the complete graph on n vertices with one edge removed. This is not vertex-transitive, but the largest antichain is exactly the largest layer, i.e. the collection of all singletons. Similarly the path P_n, while not vertex-transitive, is close to the vertex-transitive cycle C_n, and we believe the conclusion of Conjecture 3 holds for $G = P_n$ also:

Conjecture 4.

$$s(P_n) = \max\{|Q^{(r)}(P_n)| :\ 0 \leq r \leq n\}.$$

More generally, perhaps the following should be true:

Conjecture 5. For any $k \in \mathbb{N}$, there exists $n_0 = n_0(k) \in \mathbb{N}$ such that if G is a graph on $n \geq n_0$ vertices which can be made vertex-transitive by making at most k changes to its edge-set, then $s(G) = \max\{|Q^{(r)}(G)|\}$.

Note we certainly cannot strengthen the above by having $k = k(n)$ grow at a linear rate with n: if G is the star on $[n]$ with edges $\{1i :\ 2 \leq i \leq n\}$ then the width of G is larger than the largest layer of $Q(G)$ by 1. Perhaps a slower growing $k = k(n)$ may be possible.

In a different direction, while not vertex-transitive, the Erdős-Rényi random graph model $\mathcal{G}_{n,p}$ is (typically) fairly homogeneous, and treats all vertices in $[n]$ in the same way. In this case also we expect the width and largest layer to have almost the same size, at least in the range $p = O(1/n)$:

Conjecture 6. Let $p = p(n) = O(1/n)$. Then with high probability,

$$s(G_{n,p}) = (1 + o(1)) \max\{|Q^{(r)}(G_{n,p})| :\ 0 \leq r \leq n\}.$$

The reason we suggest restricting to this range of p is the following. Suppose $\alpha > 0$. Writing $p = cn^{-1}$ and $r = \alpha n$, we have that the expected number of independent sets of size r in $G_{n,p}$ is

$$\binom{n}{\alpha n}(1-p)^{\binom{\alpha n}{2}} = \exp\left(n\left(\alpha \log\frac{1}{\alpha} + (1-\alpha)\log\frac{1}{1-\alpha} - \frac{c\alpha^2}{2} + o(1)\right)\right).$$

Thus if $c = c(n) \to \infty$ as $n \to \infty$ there are with high probability no sets of size at least αn inside $Q(G_{n,p})$ for any fixed $\alpha > 0$. The $G_{n,p}$-independent hypercube in this case is thus very sparse, and its behaviour is harder to predict.

1.3 Results and structure of the paper

In their study of skewincident families, Cohen, Fachini and Körner [2] found themselves needing to give a bound on $s_n(P_n)$. They showed

$$\begin{aligned} s(P_n) &\leq |Q(P_{n-1})| \\ &= \left(\frac{2}{1+\sqrt{5}} + o(1)\right) |Q(P_n)|, \end{aligned}$$

a bound which was sufficient for their purposes, but which, as they observed, is fairly weak. They asked for the value of $s(P_n)$, and remarked that none of the classical proofs of Sperner's theorem seemed to adapt to this setting. The main purpose of this paper is to try and answer their question.

We shall focus on $Q(P_n)$ and Conjecture 4, though our techniques also apply to $Q(C_n)$ and $Q(G_{n,p})$. We show :

Theorem 3. *There exists a constant $C > 1$ such that*

$$s(P_n) \leq C \max_{0 \leq r \leq n} |Q^{(r)}(P_n)|.$$

This improves the earlier bound of Cohen, Fachini and Körner [2] by a multiplicative factor of $O(n^{-1/2})$. It is however a far cry from Conjecture 4, and in addition has a rather calculation-intensive proof.

Our paper is structured as follows. In Section 2, we run through some preliminaries. In Section 3, we prove Theorem 3.

In the last two sections, we prove small cases of Conjecture 4, briefly discuss why some classical proofs of Sperner's theorem do not adapt well to the Fibonacci cube setting, and outline how the proof of Theorem 3 can be made to work in a more general setting.

2 Preliminaries

2.1 Counting in the Fibonacci cube

First of all, let us work out how large $Q(P_n)$ is. The *Fibonacci sequence* $(F_n)_{n \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}}$ is the sequence defined by the initial values $F_0 = 0$, $F_1 = 1$ and the recurrence relation $F_{n+2} = F_{n+1} + F_n$ for all $n \geq 0$.

Lemma 4.

$$|Q(P_n)| = F_{n+2}.$$

Proof. This is a well known fact: we may consider the elements of $Q(P_n)$ as zero-one sequences $\mathbf{s}$ of length n with no consecutive ones. We have $Q(P_1) = \{0, 1\}$ and $Q(P_2) = \{00, 10, 01\}$, so that $|Q(P_1)| = 2 = F_3$ and $|Q(P_2)| = 3 = F_4$. We can construct $Q(P_n)$ for $n \geq 3$ inductively by concatenation as follows:

$$Q(P_n) = \{\mathbf{s}0 : \ \mathbf{s} \in Q(P_{n-1})\} \cup \{\mathbf{s}01 : \ \mathbf{s} \in Q(P_{n-2})\}.$$

Thus $|Q(P_n)| = |Q(P_{n-1})| + |Q(P_{n-2})|$ for $n \geq 3$. Our claim follows by induction. □

Next, let us compute the size $q_n^r = |Q^{(r)}(P_n)|$ of a layer in $Q(P_n)$.

Lemma 5.

$$q_n^r = \binom{n-r+1}{r}$$

(We follow the standard convention that a binomial coefficient $\binom{a}{b}$ with $b > a$ or $b < 0$ evaluates to zero.)

Proof. Note that $Q^{(r)}(P_n)$ is empty for $r > \lceil n/2 \rceil$, so we may assume $r \leq \lceil n/2 \rceil$. We build all zero-one sequences of length n containing exactly r ones and such that all ones are separated by at least one zero as follows. We begin with the separated sequence $1010101\ldots01$ of length $2r-1$ and containing r ones and $(r-1)$ zeroes. Then we insert zeroes in the $(r+1)$ 'bins' defined by the gaps between successive 1s, the gap to the left of the leftmost 1 and the gap to the right of the rightmost 1. We have $n-2r+1$ zeroes to insert into these bins. The number of ways of partitioning $n-2r+1$ objects into $r+1$ labelled lots is just $\binom{n-r+1}{r}$, proving our claim.

□

Now let us identify the largest layers of $Q(P_n)$.

Lemma 6. *Let $r_\star$ be an integer maximising the layer size $|Q^{(r)}(P_n)|$. Then,*

$$r_\star = \left\lceil \frac{1}{10}\left\{5n+2-\sqrt{5n^2+20n+24}\right\}\right\rceil$$

or

$$r_\star = \frac{1}{10}\left\{5n+2-\sqrt{5n^2+20n+24}\right\}+1.$$

Remark 1. *The maximal layer thus satisfies $r_\star = \frac{5-\sqrt{5}}{10}n + O(1)$.*

Proof. We consider the ratio between the sizes of two consecutive layers of $Q(P_n)$.

$$\frac{\left|Q^{(r+1)}(P_n)\right|}{\left|Q^{(r)}(P_n)\right|} = \binom{n-r}{r+1} \Big/ \binom{n-r+1}{r}$$

This is greater or equal to 1 if and only if r satisfies

$$5r^2 - r(5n+2) + (n^2-1) \geq 0$$

which in the range $0 \leq r \leq \lceil n/2 \rceil$ happens if and only if

$$r \leq \frac{1}{10}\left\{5n+2-\sqrt{5n^2+20n+24}\right\}.$$

The lemma follows.

□

Now let us consider $Q(P_n)$ as a directed graph $D(P_n)$ by setting a directed edge from A to B if $B = A \cup \{b\}$ for some $b \notin A$, i.e. if B covers A in the partial order induced by $\subseteq$.

Definition 5. The *in-degree* $d^-(A)$ of a set $A \in Q(P_n)$ is the number of edges of $D(P_n)$ directed into A, while the *out-degree* $d^+(A)$ is the number of edges of $D(P_n)$ directed out of A.

Given a set $A \in Q_n^{(r)}$, its in-degree $d^-(A)$ is always exactly r. As we shall see, however, the out-degree of A could take any integer value between $n-3r$ and $n-2r$.

Write $Q^{(r),d}(P_n)$ for the collection of elements of $Q^{(r)}(P_n)$ with out-degree equal to d, and let $q^{r,d} = q_n^{r,d} = |Q^{(r),d}(P_n)|$.

Lemma 7.

$$q_n^{r,d} = \binom{r+1}{d-n+3r}\binom{n-2r}{n-2r-d}.$$

Proof. We can characterise the out-degree in terms of 'empty bins'. Recall that in Lemma 5 we built $Q^{(r)}(P_n)$ from the zero-one sequence of length $2r-1$, $1010\ldots101$ by placing the $n-2r+1$ remaining zeroes into the $r+1$ 'bins' defined by the gaps between consecutive 1s. Suppose i zeroes have been placed in bin j. Then the corresponding interval of zeroes will contribute $i-1$ to the outdegree. Thus the out-degree associated with a zero-one sequence $\mathbf{s}$ is

$$\begin{aligned} d &= n-2r+1-(r+1-z(\mathbf{s})) \\ &= n-3r+z(\mathbf{s}), \end{aligned}$$

where $z(\mathbf{s})$ is the number of bins which have not received any zero.

Now, how many of our zero-one strings have z empty bins? There are $\binom{r+1}{z}$ ways of choosing the bins which will be empty, whereupon we need to put at least one zero into the remaining $r+1-z$ bins. We then have to allocate the remaining $n-2r+1-(r+1-z) = n-3r+z$ zeroes to the $r+1-z$ nonempty bins; there are, as we observed in the proof of Lemma 5, $\binom{n-2r}{r-z}$ ways of doing this. Setting $z = d-n+3r$ concludes the proof of the lemma. □

Note Lemma 7 implies that $q^{r,d} \neq 0$ if and only if $n-3r \leq d \leq n-2r$. Let us give an example of sequences attaining these bounds. The zero-one sequence consisting of r 010-blocks followed by a single block consisting of $n-3r$ zeroes has out-degree exactly $n-3r$. On the other hand, the zero-one sequence consiting of r 10-blocks followed by a single block consisting of $n-2r$ zeroes has out-degree exactly $n-2r$. These two examples are the extremes we have to contend with inside a layer of the Fibonacci cube.

Lemma 7 has the following corollary:

Corollary 8. *Let r, n be fixed, and let $d_\star = d_\star(r,n)$ be an integer maximising $q_n^{r,d}$. Then*

$$d_\star = \left\lceil \frac{(n-2r)^2+2n-5r-1}{n-r+3} \right\rceil$$

or

$$d_\star = \frac{(n-2r)^2+2n-5r-1}{n-r+3} + 1.$$

Thus if $r = \alpha n$ for some $\alpha > 0$, then the most common out-degree in $Q^{(r)}(P_n)$ is $d_\star(r,n) = \frac{(1-2\alpha)^2}{1-\alpha}n + O(1)$. Before we give a proof of Corollary 8, let us give a heuristic justification of why we expect $d_\star$ to be about this. In the proof of Lemma 7 we established a correspondence between out-degree and (roughly speaking) the number of occurences of gaps of length one between successive 1s (ie occurences of 101). Now what is the probability that the gap between the first two 1s has length 1? Contracting a gap of length 1 between the first two 1s gives us a member of $Q^{r-1}(P_{n-2})$. Thus the likelihood of this occuring is roughly

$$\left|Q^{r-1}(P_{n-2})\right| / \left|Q^r(P_n)\right| = r/(n-r+1) \approx \alpha/(1-\alpha)$$

when $r = \alpha n$. Since there are $r+1 \approx \alpha n$ gaps, the expected number of short gaps is $z \approx n\alpha^2/(1-\alpha)$, which implies in turn that the expected out-degree is $d = n - 3r + z \approx n(1-2\alpha)^2/(1-\alpha)$. Unsurprisingly the maximum of $q^{r,d}$ is attained when d is close to the expected out-degree. Having said this, we turn to a formal argument.

Proof of Corollary 8. Consider the ratio $q_n^{r,d+1}/q_n^{r,d}$. By Lemma 7, this is equal to

$$\begin{aligned}\frac{q_n^{r,d+1}}{q_n^{r,d}} &= \binom{r+1}{d+1-n+3r}\binom{n-2r}{n-2r-d-1} \Big/ \binom{r+1}{d-n-3r}\binom{n-2r}{n-2r-d} \\ &= \frac{d^2 - (2n-4r+1)d + (n-2r)(n-2r+1)}{d^2-(n-3r-2)d-(n-3r-1)}.\end{aligned}$$

Solving the associated linear inequality, we see that $q_n^{r,d+1}/q_n^{r,d} < 1$ when

$$d < \frac{(n-2r)^2+2n-5r-1}{n-r+3},$$

and $q_n^{r,d+1}/q_n^{r,d} \geq 1$ for

$$d \geq \frac{(n-2r)^2+2n-5r-1}{n-r+3}$$

with equality if and only if $d = \frac{(n-2r)^2+2n-5r-1}{n-r+3}$. The Lemma follows. ☐

Note that the proof of Corollary 8 establishes in fact that $q_n^{r,d}$ is strictly increasing in d until it hits its (at most two) maxima, and then becomes strictly decreasing in d. We shall use this monotonicity later on.

In the meantime, let us obtain another consequence of Corollary 8.

Corollary 9. *Let $r_\star$ be an integer maximising q_n^r, and let $r = r_\star + c\sqrt{n}$ for some $c \in [-\sqrt{\log n}, +\sqrt{\log n}]$. Then for $d_\star(r,n)$ an integer maximising $q^{r,d}$, we have*

$$d_\star(r,n) = \left(\frac{5-\sqrt{5}}{10}\right)n - \left(\frac{5\sqrt{5}-7}{2}\right)c\sqrt{n} + (10-2\sqrt{5})c^2 + O(1).$$

Proof. This is a straightforward calculation from Corollary 8, from the fact $r_\star = \frac{5-\sqrt{5}}{10}n + O(1)$ as remarked after Corollary 6, and from the Taylor expansion

of $(1+x)^{-1}$ about 0: we know

$$\begin{aligned} r &= r_\star + c\sqrt{n} \\ &= \frac{5-\sqrt{5}}{10} + c\sqrt{n} + O(1).\end{aligned}$$

Thus,

$$\begin{aligned} d_\star(r,n) &= \frac{(n-r)^2)^2}{n-r} + O(1) \\ &= \frac{\left(\frac{2\sqrt{5}}{10}n - 2c\sqrt{n}\right)^2}{\frac{5+\sqrt{5}}{10}n - c\sqrt{n}} + O(1) \\ &= \left(\frac{2}{5+\sqrt{5}}n - \frac{8\sqrt{5}}{5+\sqrt{5}}c\sqrt{n} + \frac{40c^2}{5+\sqrt{5}}\right) \Big/ \left(1 - \frac{10}{5+\sqrt{5}}c\sqrt{n}\right) + O(1) \\ &= \frac{5-\sqrt{5}}{10}n - \left(\frac{8\sqrt{5}}{5+\sqrt{5}} - \frac{20}{(5+\sqrt{5})^2}\right)c\sqrt{n} + \frac{40c^2}{5+\sqrt{5}} + O(1) \\ &= \frac{5-\sqrt{5}}{10}n - \frac{5\sqrt{5}-7}{2}c\sqrt{n} + (10-2\sqrt{5})c^2 + O(1). \end{aligned}$$

□

2.2 Concentration

With the combinatorial preliminaries out of the way, let us obtain some concentration results for $q^r = q^r_n = \left|Q^{(r)}(P_n)\right|$ and $q^{r,d} = \left|Q^{(r),d}(P_n)\right|$. Given the binomial coefficients appearing in Lemmas 5 and 7, we expect Chernoff-type concentration of both the weight in $Q(P_n)$ around the heaviest layer(s) $Q^{(r_\star)}(P_n)$ and of the out-degrees in $Q^{(r)}(P_n)$ around the likeliest out-degree(s) $d_\star = d_\star(r,n)$.

Thus by Hall's Theorem [6] we expect, analogously to Q_n, that the largest layer in $Q(P_n)$ will occur when the in-degree and the average out-degree are the same – that is, by the observation after Corollary 8, when $r \approx (n-2r)^2/(n-r)$. Solving this yields $r \approx \frac{(5-\sqrt{5})}{10}n$, matching the estimate we made after Lemma 6 and giving perhaps better intuition as to why the maximum occurs at this point.

These expectations we have regarding concentration are indeed correct, and can be proved formally using Stirling's approximation,

$$m! = \left(1 + O\left(\frac{1}{m}\right)\right)\sqrt{2\pi m}\left(\frac{m}{e}\right)^m,$$

and some simple calculus.

Let F be the function $x \mapsto (1-x)\log(1-x) - x\log x - (1-2x)\log(1-2x)$.

Lemma 10. *Let $\alpha = \alpha(n)$ be a sequence of real number with $10^{-9} < \alpha(n) < \frac{1}{2} - 10^{-9}$ and $n\alpha \in \mathbb{N}$ for $n \geq 4$. Then*

$$q_n^{\alpha n} = \left(\frac{(1-\alpha)\sqrt{1-\alpha}}{\sqrt{2\pi\alpha(1-2\alpha)}(1-2\alpha)} + O\left(\frac{1}{n}\right)\right) n^{-1/2}\exp\left(nF(\alpha)\right).$$

Proof. This is a straightforward calculation from Lemma 5 and Stirling's formula:

$$\begin{aligned} q_n^{\alpha n} &= \binom{n-\alpha n+1}{\alpha n} \\ &= \frac{((1-\alpha)n)!}{(\alpha n)!((1-2\alpha)n)!}\frac{(1-\alpha)n+1}{(1-2\alpha)n+1}. \end{aligned}$$

Substituting Stirling's approximation in the above (which we can do since α and $1-2\alpha$ are both bounded away from 0) then yields the claimed equality. ☐

As expected given that the maximum of $q_n^{\alpha n}$ occurs at $\alpha = \frac{5-\sqrt{5}}{10} + O(n^{-1})$, we find that F attains a global maximum at $\frac{5-\sqrt{5}}{10}$:

$$F'(x) = \log\left(\frac{(1-2x)^2}{x(1-x)}\right),$$

which is strictly positive for $x < \frac{5-\sqrt{5}}{10}$, vanishes at $\frac{5-\sqrt{5}}{10}$ and becomes strictly negative for $x > \frac{5-\sqrt{5}}{10}$.

Computing the second derivative, we find $F''(\frac{5-\sqrt{5}}{10}) = -5\sqrt{5}$.

Corollary 11. *Let $Q^{(r_\star)}(P_n)$ be a largest layer of $Q(P_n)$. Then the following hold:*

(i) if $r = r_\star + c\sqrt{n}$ for some $c \in [-\sqrt{\log n}, \sqrt{\log n}]$, then

$$q_n^r = \exp\left(-\frac{5\sqrt{5}c^2}{2} + o(1)\right) q_n^{r_\star};$$

(ii) there are

$$O\left(n \exp\left(-\frac{5\sqrt{5}}{2}\log n\right) q_n^{r_\star}\right) = o(q_n^{r_\star})$$

sets in $Q(P_n)$ with size differing from $r_\star$ by more than $\sqrt{n\log n}$.

Proof. Immediate from Lemma 10 and the calculation above. ☐

We now turn to out-degree concentration. Set G to be the function

$$\begin{aligned}(x,y) \mapsto\, & 2x\log x + 2(1-2x)\log(1-2x) - y\log y - 2(x-y)\log(x-y) \\ & - (1-x)\log(1-x) - (1-3x+y)\log(1-3x+y).\end{aligned}$$

Lemma 12. *Let $\alpha = \alpha(n)$, and $\beta = \beta(n)$ be sequences of real numbers satisfying $10^{-9} < \beta(n) < \alpha(n) - 10^{-9}$ and $\alpha(n) < (1+\beta-10^{-9})/3$ and $n\alpha, n\beta \in \mathbb{N}$ for $n \geq 9$. Then*

$$q_n^{\alpha n,(1-3\alpha+\beta)n} = \left(\frac{\alpha}{2\pi(\alpha-\beta)^2\sqrt{\beta(1-3\alpha+\beta)}} + O\left(\frac{1}{n}\right)\right)\exp\left(nG(\alpha,\beta)\right).$$

Proof. This is a straightforward calculation from Lemma 7 and Stirling's formula:

$$\begin{aligned} q_n^{\alpha n,(1-3\alpha+\beta)n} &= \binom{\alpha n+1}{\beta n}\binom{(1-2\alpha)n}{(\alpha-\beta)n} \\ &= \frac{\alpha n+1}{(\alpha-\beta)n+1}\frac{(\alpha n)!}{((\alpha-\beta)n)!(\beta n)!}\frac{((1-2\alpha)n)!}{((\alpha-\beta)n)!((1-3\alpha+\beta)n!)}\end{aligned}$$

Substituting Stirling's approximation in the above then yields the claimed equality. (We can do this since α, β, $(\alpha-\beta)$, $1-2\alpha$ and $(1-3\alpha+\beta)$ are all bounded away from 0. Note that for $n \geq 9$ there exist at least two distinct integers m_1 and m_2 with $\frac{n}{4} \leq m_1 < m_2 \leq \frac{n}{3}$, and hence legal choices of $\alpha(n)$ and $\beta(n)$, so that our claim is not vacuous.) ☐

Again it is no surprise that for a fixed α, the function $G_\alpha : \ y \mapsto G(\alpha, y)$ attains a global maximum at $\beta = \frac{\alpha^2}{1-\alpha}$:

$$G'_\alpha(y) = \log\left(\frac{(\alpha - y)^2}{y(1 - 3\alpha + y)}\right),$$

which is strictly positive for $y < \frac{\alpha^2}{1-\alpha}$, vanishes at $\frac{\alpha^2}{1-\alpha}$ and becomes strictly negative for $x > \frac{\alpha^2}{1-\alpha}$.

Computing the second derivative, we find

$$G''_\alpha\left(\frac{\alpha^2}{1-\alpha}\right) = -\frac{(1-\alpha)^3}{\alpha^2(1-2\alpha)^2}.$$

In particular for $\alpha = \frac{5-\sqrt{5}}{10} + O(\sqrt{\frac{\log n}{n}})$, we have $G''_\alpha(\frac{\alpha^2}{1-\alpha}) = \frac{25+11\sqrt{5}}{2} + O(\sqrt{\frac{\log n}{n}})$.

Corollary 13. *Let $r_\star$ be an integer maximising q_n^r, and let $r = r_\star + O(\sqrt{n \log n})$. Let $d_\star = d_\star(r, n)$ be an integer maximising $q_n^{r,d}$. Then*

(i) if $d = d_\star + c\sqrt{n}$ for some $c \in [-\sqrt{\log n}, +\sqrt{\log n}]$, then

$$q_n^{r,d} = \exp\left(-\frac{(25+11\sqrt{5})c^2}{8} + o(1)\right) q_n^{r,d_\star}$$

(ii) there are

$$O\left(n \exp\left(-\frac{(25+11\sqrt{5})}{8}\log n\right) q_n^{r,d_\star}\right) = o\left(n^{-1} q_n^{r,d_\star}\right)$$

sets in $Q^{(r)}(P_n)$ with out-degree differing from $d_\star$ by more than $\sqrt{n \log n}$.

2.3 Summation bounds

We shall also need the following simple bounds on a sum of exponentials.

Lemma 14. *Let $a > 0$. Then*

$$\sqrt{\frac{\pi}{4a}} e^{-a} \leq \sum_{i \geq 1} e^{-ai^2} \leq \sqrt{\frac{\pi}{2a}}.$$

Proof. This is a simple exercise in the change of variables under integration and the comparison of integrals with sums:

$$\begin{aligned}
\sqrt{\frac{\pi}{4a}} e^{-a} &= \left(\int_0^{\pi/2} \int_{\sqrt{2}}^{+\infty} r e^{-ar^2} dr d\theta\right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \\
&\leq \int_1^{+\infty} e^{-ax^2} dx \\
&\leq \sum_{i \geq 1} e^{-ai^2} \\
&\leq \int_0^{+\infty} e^{-ax^2} dx \\
&= \left(\int_0^{\pi/2} \int_0^{+\infty} r e^{-ar^2} dr d\theta\right)^{\frac{1}{2}} = \sqrt{\frac{\pi}{2a}}.
\end{aligned}$$

□

Corollary 15. *Let $g(x) = a_0 + a_1 x + a_2 x^2$ be a quadratic polynomial with $a_2 > 0$. Then*

$$\sum_{i\in\mathbb{Z}} e^{-g(i)} \le C(g),$$

where $C(g)$ is a constant depending only on a_0, a_1 and a_2.

Proof.

$$\begin{aligned}\sum_{i\in\mathbb{Z}} e^{-g(i)} \le C(a_0,a_1,a_2) &= \sum_{i\in\mathbb{Z}} \exp\left(-a_2(i+\frac{a_1}{2a_2})^2 + \frac{{a_1}^2}{4a_2} - a_0\right)\\ &\le \exp\left(\frac{{a_1}^2}{4a_2} - a_0\right)\left(1 + \sum_{i\in\mathbb{Z}} 2\exp(-a_2 i^2)\right),\end{aligned}$$

whence we are done by Lemma 14. ☐

Lemma 14 can be used with Corollary 13 to prove the following simple Lemma.

Lemma 16. *There are constants $C_1 > 0$ and $C_2 > 0$ such that if r is an integer with $|r - r_\star| \le \sqrt{n\log n}$ and $d_\star = d_\star(r,n)$ is an integer maximising $q_n^{r,d}$, then*

$$C_1 \frac{q_n^r}{\sqrt{n}} \le q_n^{r,d_\star} \le C_2 \frac{q_n^r}{\sqrt{n}}.$$

(We could also have proved this by directly calculating the ratio $q_n^{r,d_\star}/q_n^r$ from Lemmas 5, 7 and Corollary 8.)

Proof. By Corollary 13 part (ii) we may throw away all sets in $Q_{n,r}$ with out-degree differing from $d_\star$ by more than $\sqrt{n\log n}$.

Now, divide the remainining sets in $Q^{(r)}(P_n)$ into *out-degree intervals* of width $\sqrt{n}$:

$$I_i = \{A : \ d_\star + i\sqrt{n} \le d^+(A) < d_\star + (i+1)\sqrt{n}\}$$

for $i \in \mathbb{Z} \cap [-\sqrt{\log n}, \sqrt{\log n}]$. Then we have

$$\begin{aligned} q_n^r &= \sum_i |I_i| + o(q_n^r)\\ &\qquad \text{by Corollary 13 part (ii)}\\ &\le \sum_{i\ge 0} q_n^{r,\lceil d_\star + i\sqrt{n}\rceil}\sqrt{n} + \sum_{i<0} q_n^{r,\lfloor d_\star+(i+1)\sqrt{n}\rfloor}\sqrt{n}\\ &\qquad \text{since } q^{r,d} \text{ monotonically decreases as } d \text{ moves away from } d_\star\\ &\le 2\sqrt{n}\sum_{i\ge 0}\exp\left(-\left(\frac{25+11\sqrt{5}}{8}\right)i^2 + o(1)\right) q_n^{r,d_\star}\\ &\qquad \text{by Corollary 13 part (i),}\end{aligned}$$

which by Lemma 14 is at most $\frac{\sqrt{n}}{C_1} q_n^{r,d_\star}$ for some absolute constant $C_1 > 0$.

The inequality in the other direction follows in much the same way. ☐

3 Proof of Theorem 3

We can now proceed to the proof of Theorem 3 proper. Let $Q^{(r_\star)}(P_n)$ be a largest layer of $Q(P_n)$, and for every r let $d_\star(r,n)$ be an integer maximising $q_n^{r,d_\star}$. By Corollary 11, we can restrict our attention in a proof of Theorem 3 to layers r with $|r-r_\star| \leq \sqrt{n\log n}$. We denote by $Q'(P_n)$ the corresponding subset of $Q(P_n)$. Note that for n sufficiently large (say $n>100$) every element of $Q'(P_n)$ has nonzero out-degree in the directed graph $D(P_n)$.

3.1 Dissection into blocks and overlapping trapeziums

Let $c_1 = 1/100$. We divide $Q'(P_n)$ into *blocks* of layers

$$B_t = \bigcup \left\{ Q^{(r)}(P_n) : \ r_\star + c_1 t\sqrt{n} \leq r \leq r_\star + c_1(t+1)\sqrt{n} \right\},$$

each of which is roughly $c_1\sqrt{n}$ layers wide. (Here t takes integer values in $[-\frac{\sqrt{\log n}}{c_1}, \frac{\sqrt{\log n}}{c_1}]$.)

If $t \geq 0$, we divide the top layer $Q^{(r_+)}(P_n)$ of B_t into *outdegree intervals*

$$I_{s,t} = \bigcup \left\{ Q^{(r_+),d}(P_n) : \ d_\star(r_+,n) + s\sqrt{n} \leq d \leq d_\star(r_+,n) + (s+1)\sqrt{n} \right\},$$

each of which ranges over roughly $\sqrt{n}$ different outdegrees. (Here s lies in $[-\sqrt{\log n}, \sqrt{\log n}] \cap \mathbb{Z}$.)

Each such interval $I_{s,t}$ defines a *trapezium*

$$T_{s,t} = \{A \in B_t : \exists A' \in I_{s,t} \text{ with } A \subseteq A'\}.$$

For n sufficiently large, the union of these (overlapping) trapeziums covers all of B_t (since all sets in B_t have positive outdegree).

If on the other hand $t<0$, we divide the bottom layer $Q^{(r_-)}(P_n)$ of B_t into outdegree intervals

$$I_{s,t} = \bigcup \left\{ Q^{(r_-),d}(P_n) : \ d_\star(r_-,n) + s\sqrt{n} \leq d \leq d_\star(r_-,n) + (s+1)\sqrt{n} \right\},$$

with again each interval defining a trapezium

$$T_{s,t} = \{A \in B_t : \exists A' \in I_{s,t} \text{ with } A' \subseteq A\}.$$

Taken together, the overlapping trapeziums $T_{s,t}$ cover all of B_t in this case also.

3.2 Strategy

The heart of our proof of Theorem 3 is the following lemma.

Lemma 17. *There is an absolute constant $C_3 > 1$ such that for every antichain $\mathcal{A} \subseteq Q(P_n)$ and every integer $t \in [-\frac{\sqrt{\log n}}{c_1}, \frac{\sqrt{\log n}}{c_1}]$ we have*

$$|\mathcal{A} \cap B_t| \leq C_3 \max\{q_n^r : \ Q^{(r)}(P_n) \subseteq B_t\}.$$

Provided we are able to prove Lemma 17, Theorem 3 is straightforward from our concentration results on the layer size:

Proof of Theorem 3 from Lemma 17. Let $\mathcal{A}$ be an antichain. Then

$$\begin{aligned}
|\mathcal{A}| &= \sum_t |\mathcal{A} \cap B_t| + o(q_n^{r_\star}) \\
&\qquad \text{by Corollary 13 part (ii)} \\
&\leq \sum_t C_3 \max\{q_n^r : \ Q^{(r)}(P_n) \subseteq B_t\} + o(q_n^{r_\star}) \\
&\qquad \text{by Lemma 17} \\
&= C_3 \left(\sum_{t \geq 0} q_n^{r_\star + \lceil c_1 t \sqrt{n} \rceil} + \sum_{t<0} q_n^{r_\star + \lfloor c_1 (t+1) \sqrt{n} \rfloor} \right) + o(q_n^{r_\star}) \\
&\leq 2C_3 \left(\sum_{t \geq 0} \exp\left(-\frac{5\sqrt{5}{c_1}^2}{2} t^2 + o(1) \right) q_n^{r_\star} \right) + o(q_n^{r_\star}) \\
&\qquad \text{by Corollary 13 part (i)} \\
&\leq C q_n^{r_\star} \\
&\qquad \text{for some absolute constant } C > 0 \text{, by Lemma 14.}
\end{aligned}$$

□

Given this, let us focus on the proof of Lemma 17. This will be a *shadow argument.*

Definition 6. The *lower shadow* of a family $\mathcal{B} \subseteq Q(P_n)$ is

$$\partial^-(\mathcal{B}) = \{B \in Q(P_n) : \ \exists b \notin B \text{ such that } B \cup \{b\} \in \mathcal{B}\}.$$

The *upper shadow* of $\mathcal{B}$ is

$$\partial^+(\mathcal{B}) = \{B \in Q(P_n) : \ \exists b \in B \text{ such that } B \setminus \{b\} \in \mathcal{B}\}.$$

Recalling the directed graph $D(P_n)$ we associated with $Q(P_n)$, the lower shadow is the *in-neighbourhood* of $\mathcal{B}$ in $D(P_n)$ while the upper shadow is the *out-neighbourhood* of $\mathcal{B}$.

Let $\mathcal{A} = \mathcal{A}_0 \subseteq B_t$ be an antichain. Suppose that $t \geq 0$, and let r_+ be the topmost nonempty layer in $\mathcal{A} \cap B_t$. Write $\mathcal{A}^{(r_+)}$ for $\mathcal{A} \cap Q^{(r_+)}(P_n)$. Since $\mathcal{A}$ is an antichain, we have that

$$\mathcal{A}_1 = \left(\mathcal{A} \setminus \mathcal{A}^{(r_+)}\right) \cup \partial^-(\mathcal{A}^{(r_+)})$$

is also an antichain. Repeating this procedure with $\mathcal{A}_1$, then $\mathcal{A}_2$, etc, we can 'push down' our family into the bottom layer of B_t. We will thus be done in the proof of Lemma 17 if we can show we have not shrunk the size of our family by more than a constant factor in the process. (The $t < 0$ case proceeds identically with upper shadows instead of lower shadows.)

To do this, we perform some careful accounting, and this is where our trapeziums (and, unfortunately, some tedious calculations) come in. Roughly speaking, the further away the out-degree lies from the layer's average out-degree, the more we could be shrinking our family when taking lower shadows. This effect is balanced out by the fact that the further we are from the average out-degree the fewer sets we have at our disposal.

3.3 Shadows in the trapeziums

Let $t \geq 0$ and $\mathcal{A} \subseteq B_t$ be a subset of B_t. Let $r_- = r_\star + \lceil c_1 t\sqrt{n}\rceil$ and $r_+ = r_\star + \lfloor c_1(t+1)\sqrt{n}\rfloor$ be the bottom-most and top-most layers of B_t respectively. Let

$$\phi(\mathcal{A}) = \left\{A \in Q^{(r_-)}(P_n) :\ \exists A' \in \mathcal{A} \text{ such that } A \subseteq A'\right\}$$

be the collection of sets in the bottom-most layer of B_t which are contained in an element of $\mathcal{A}$.

In this subsection, we prove the case $t \geq 0$ of Lemma 17 by taking shadows in trapeziums.

Proof of case $t \geq 0$ of Lemma 17. Let $\mathcal{A}$ be an antichain. Without loss of generality, we may assume $\mathcal{A} \subseteq B_t$. We shall show that

$$|\mathcal{A}| - |\phi(\mathcal{A})| \leq C_3' q_n^{r_-}$$

for some absolute constant $C_3' > 0$, from which Lemma 17 follows with $C = C_3' + 1$.

For every integer $s \in [-\sqrt{\log n}, \sqrt{\log n}]$, let $\mathcal{A}_s = \mathcal{A} \cap T_{s,t}$ be the intersection of $\mathcal{A}$ with the trapezium $T_{s,t}$.

Observe that deleting an element from a set in P_n can increase its out-degree by $1, 2$ or 3. It follows that sets in $\phi(\mathcal{A}_s)$ have outdegree d satisfying

$$d_\star(r_+, n) + s\sqrt{n} + c_1\sqrt{n} \leq d \leq d_\star(r_+, n) + (s+1)\sqrt{n} + 3c_1\sqrt{n}.$$

As $c_1 = 1/100$ it follows that $\phi(\mathcal{A}_s)$ is disjoint from $\phi(\mathcal{A}_{s+2})$ for all s (since $3c_1\sqrt{n} < \sqrt{n} + c_1\sqrt{n}$). In particular, sets in $Q^{(r_-)}(P_n)$ are contained in at most two distinct $\phi(\mathcal{A}_s)$, whence

$$\left(\sum_s |\phi(\mathcal{A}_s)|\right) - \left|\bigcup_s \phi(\mathcal{A}_s)\right| \leq |Q^{(r_-)}(P_n)| = q_n^{r_-}.$$

Now we shall show $|\phi(\mathcal{A}_s)|$ is not much smaller than $\mathcal{A}_s$. To obtain $\phi(\mathcal{A}_s)$ from $\mathcal{A}_s$, we repeatedly take the lower shadow of the highest nonempty layer. Since $\mathcal{A}$ (and hence $\mathcal{A}_s$) is an antichain, we know that the shadow of the family's highest layer is disjoint from the rest of the family. Thus our only concern is that the family could be shrinking every time we take a lower shadow.

Observe that if $\mathcal{B} \subset Q^{(r)}(P_n)$ and the maximum outdegree in the lower shadow of $\mathcal{B}$ is Δ^+, then, by counting edges from $\partial^-\mathcal{B}$ to $Q^{(r)}(P_n)$ we have:

$$|\partial^-\mathcal{B}| \geq \frac{r}{\Delta^+}|\mathcal{B}|.$$

Going from $\mathcal{A}_s$ to $\phi(\mathcal{A}_s)$, the worst ratio we would have to contend with is thus when $r = r_- = r_\star + c_1 t\sqrt{n} + O(1)$ and $\Delta^+ = d_\star(r_+, n) + (s+1)\sqrt{n} + 3c_1\sqrt{n} + O(1)$. Now by Lemma 6,

$$r_\star = \frac{5-\sqrt{5}}{10}n + O(1)$$

and by Corollary 9

$$d_\star(r_+, n) = \frac{5-\sqrt{5}}{10}n - \left(\frac{5\sqrt{5}-7}{2}\right)c_1(t+1)\sqrt{n} + (10 - 2\sqrt{5})c^2 + O(1).$$

A quick calculation then shows that the worst-case ratio is

$$
\begin{aligned}
\frac{r_-}{\Delta^+} &= \frac{\frac{5-\sqrt{5}}{10}n + c_1 t\sqrt{n}}{\frac{5-\sqrt{5}}{10}n - \left(\frac{5\sqrt{5}-7}{2}c_1(t+1) - (s+1)\right)\sqrt{n} + (10-2\sqrt{5})c^2} + O\left(\frac{1}{n}\right)\\
&= \frac{1 + \frac{10c_1 t}{5-\sqrt{5}}n^{-1/2}}{1 - \left(\frac{25\sqrt{5}-35}{5-\sqrt{5}}c_1(t+1) - \frac{10(s+1)}{5-\sqrt{5}}\right)n^{-1/2}} + O\left(\frac{\log n}{n}\right)\\
&= 1 - \frac{10}{5-\sqrt{5}}\left(s + 1 - \frac{5\sqrt{5}-7}{2}c_1 - \frac{5-\sqrt{5}}{2}c_1 t\right)n^{-1/2} + O\left(\frac{\log n}{n}\right).
\end{aligned}
$$

Write $f_t(s)$ for the expression

$$
f_t(s) = \frac{10}{5-\sqrt{5}}\left(s + 1 - \frac{5\sqrt{5}-7}{2}c_1 - \frac{5-\sqrt{5}}{2}c_1 t\right).
$$

If $f_t(s) < 0$, then we have nothing to worry about: our family does not shrink as we take successive shadows. On the other hand if $f_t(s) \geq 0$, then we have

$$
\begin{aligned}
|\phi(\mathcal{A}_s)| &\geq \left(1 - f_t(s)n^{-1/2} + O\left(\frac{\log n}{n}\right)\right)^{c_1\sqrt{n}} |\mathcal{A}_s|\\
&= \exp\left(-c_1 f_t(s) + O\left(\frac{\log n}{n^{-1/2}}\right)\right)|\mathcal{A}_s|.
\end{aligned}
$$

We now give an upper bound the size of $\phi(\mathcal{A}_s)$ when $f_t(s) \geq 0$ using our concentration results. Writing s_0 for the unique real solution to $f_t(s) = 0$,

$$
s_0 = -1 + \frac{5\sqrt{5}-7}{2}c_1 + \frac{5-\sqrt{5}}{2}c_1 t)
$$

Since $c_1 = 1/100$ and $t \geq 0$, we certainly have $s_0 > -1$.

By Corollary 9,

$$
d_\star(r_-, n) - d_\star(r_+, n) = \left(\frac{5\sqrt{5}-7}{10}\right)c_1\sqrt{n} + O\left(\log n\right).
$$

The degrees in $\phi(\mathcal{A}_s)$ are thus at least

$$
\begin{aligned}
\delta_s &= d_{r_+,n} + s\sqrt{n} + c_1\sqrt{n}\\
&= d_\star(r_-, n) + s\sqrt{n} - \frac{5\sqrt{5}-9}{2}c_1 + O\left(\log n\right)\\
&= d_\star(r_-, n) + g(s)\sqrt{n} + O\left(\log n\right)
\end{aligned}
$$

where g denotes the linear function $s \mapsto s - \left(\frac{5\sqrt{5}-9}{2}\right)c_1$. As $s_0 > -1$, as $c_1 = 1/100$ and as s is an integer, it follows from the above that apart from at most one value of s (namely $s = 0$), the degree in $\phi(\mathcal{A}_s)$ is greater than $d_\star(r_-, n)$ by a term of order $\sqrt{n}$. We can then use our concentration result and the monotonicity of $q_n^{r_-,d}$ away from $d_\star(r_-, n)$ to give bounds on $\phi(\mathcal{A}_s)$: provided $s \geq 1$,

$$\begin{aligned}|\phi(\mathcal{A}_s)| &\leq (\sqrt{n} + 2c_1\sqrt{n})q_n^{r_-,\delta_s}\\ &= (2c_1+1)\sqrt{n}q_n^{r_-,d_\star(r_-,n)} \exp\left(-\left(\frac{25+11\sqrt{5}}{8}\right)g(s)^2 + o(1)\right)\\ &\leq (2c_1+1)C_2 q_n^{r_-} \exp\left(-\left(\frac{25+11\sqrt{5}}{8}\right)g(s)^2 + o(1)\right)\end{aligned}$$

by applying Lemma 16 in the last line.

Now $f_t(s) \leq f_0(s)$ for all $t \geq 0$, so that we have

$$\begin{aligned}\sum_{s\geq s_0}|\mathcal{A}_s| &\leq \sum_{s\geq s_0}|\phi(\mathcal{A}_s)|\exp(c_1 f_t(s))(1+O(n^{-1/2}))\\ &\leq (2c_1+1)C_2 q_n^{r_-}\,(\exp(c_1 f_0(0))\\ &\quad+\sum_{s\geq 1}\exp\left(c_1 f_0(s) - \left(\frac{25+11\sqrt{5}}{8}\right)g(s)^2 + o(1)\right)\Bigg)\\ &\leq C_3'' q_n^{r_-}\end{aligned}$$

for some absolute constant $C_3'' > 0$, by observing that $g(s)^2$ is quadratic in s while $f_0(s)$ is only linear and applying Corollary 15.

We then are essentially done:

$$\begin{aligned}|\mathcal{A}| - |\phi(\mathcal{A}_s)| &\leq q_n^{r_-} + \sum_s (|\mathcal{A}_s| - |\phi(\mathcal{A}_s)|)\\ &\leq (C_3''+1)q_n^{r_-},\end{aligned}$$

from which it follows that

$$\begin{aligned}|\mathcal{A}| &\leq |\phi(\mathcal{A}_s)| + (C_3''+1)q_n^{r_-}\\ &\leq (C_3''+2)q_n^{r_-},\end{aligned}$$

with $C_3''+2$ a constant independent of t and n as required. ☐

The proof of the case $t < 0$ of Lemma 17 is essentially the same as the above, except that we use upper shadows instead of lower shadows (so as to push the family towards the largest layer rather than away from it). We conclude here the proof of Lemma 17 and with it the proof of Theorem 3.

4 Small cases of Conjecture 4

We have not tried to optimise the constant C we get in our proof of Theorem 3, as our methods will give a constant strictly greater than 1 when we believe the correct answer should be exactly 1. We have however established Conjecture 4 for some small values of n. Details follow below.

4.1 Partition into chains

A classical proof of Sperner's Theorem consists in partitioning Q_n into symmetric *chains*, each of which intersects the largest layer(s) of Q_n.

Definition 7. A *k-chain* in $Q(G)$ is a family of k distinct elements of $Q(G)$, $\{A_1, \dots A_k\}$, with $A_1 \subset A_2 \subset \dots \subset A_k$.

If Conjecture 3 is true, then it follows by a theorem of Dilworth [3] that $Q(P_n)$ can also be partitioned into disjoint chains each of which intersects the largest layer(s) of $Q(P_n)$. Finding an explicit construction of such a partition appears difficult however: $Q(P_n)$ is asymmetric, and which layer is largest changes in an awkward and aperiodic way with n. It is fairly straightforward however to find such a partition for small n.

We begin with a partition of $Q(P_1)$ into a single chain $(\emptyset, \{1\})$, then build a partition for $Q(P_n)$ iteratively for $2 \leq n \leq 9$. Our chains then come in three types: *type A* chains are chains in $Q(P_n)$ every member of which contains n; *type B* chains are chains in $Q(P_n)$ no member of which contains n; and *type C* chains are chains in $Q(P_n)$ of length at least two where only the last member contains n. Our initial partition of $Q(P_1)$ thus consisted of a single C-chain.

- An A-chain $(C_1 \cup \{n\}, C_2 \cup \{n\}, \dots C_l \cup \{n\})$ in $Q(P_n)$ gives rise to a B-chain in $Q(P_{n+1})$, namely $(C_1 \cup \{n\}, C_2 \cup \{n\}, \dots C_l \cup \{n\})$.
- A B-chain $(C_1, C_2, \dots C_l)$ in $Q(P_n)$ gives rise to (potentially) two chains in $Q(P_{n+1})$: a C-chain $(C_1, C_2, \dots C_l, C_l \cup \{n+1\})$, and (if $l > 1$), to an A-chain $(C_1 \cup \{n+1\}, C_2 \cup \{n-1\}, \dots C_{l-1} \cup \{n+1\})$.
- A C-chain $(C_1, C_2, \dots C_{l-1}, C_{l-1} \cup \{n\})$ in $Q(P_n)$ gives rise to two chains in $Q(P_{n+1})$: a B-chain $(C_1, C_2, \dots C_{l-1}, C_{l-1} \cup \{n\})$ and an A-chain $(C_1 \cup \{n+1\}, C_2 \cup \{n+1\}, \dots C_{l-2} \cup \{n+1\}, C_{l-1} \cup \{n+1\})$. (Note that by construction all C-chains have length at least 2, so that each of them does indeed produce an A-chain.)

It is easy to check that this iterative construction yields a partition of $Q(P_n)$ into chains through the largest layer for $n = 1, 2, \dots 7$ and $n = 9$. For $n = 8$, we obtain a partition of $Q(P_8)$ containing one chain not intersecting the largest layer. However we can fix this by replacing the three chains $(\{258\})$, $(\{25\}, \{257\})$ and $(\{57\})$ by the two chains $(\{25\}, \{258\})$ and $(\{57\}, \{257\})$. This establishes Conjecture 4 for all $n \leq 9$. The argument in the next subsection gives a simpler proof for $n = 2, 3 \dots 7, 9$, and proves the additional case $n = 10$.

4.2 Shadows

Another standard proof of Sperner's theorem (indeed Sperner's original proof) is to 'push' an antichain towards the largest layer of Q_n by repeatedly replacing the antichain's top-most layer by its lower shadow and the antichain's bottom-most layer by its upper shadow. Our proof of Theorem 3 is essentially a variant of this. Unfortunately, the out-degrees in $Q(P_n)$ are not sufficiently concentrated for this technique to give us even an approximate form of Conjecture 4. We can however use shadow arguments to establish some small cases of Conjecture 4.

For $n \geq 2$, set

$$Q'(P_n) = \bigcup_{\frac{n-1}{4} < r < \frac{n+2}{3}} Q^{(r)}(P_n).$$

Lemma 18. *Let $n \geq 2$ and let $\mathcal{A}$ be an antichain in $Q(P_n)$. Then there exists an antichain $\mathcal{A}'$ in $Q'(P_n)$ with $|\mathcal{A}| \leq |\mathcal{A}'|$.*

Proof. Let $\mathcal{A}$ be an antichain, and assume $\mathcal{A}$ is nonempty (for otherwise we have nothing to prove). Write $\mathcal{A}^{(r)}$ for the r^{th} layer of $\mathcal{A}$,

$$\mathcal{A}^{(r)} = \mathcal{A} \cap Q^{(r)}(P_n).$$

Let $r_+(\mathcal{A}) = \max\{r : \ \mathcal{A}^{(r)} \neq \emptyset\}$ and $r_-(\mathcal{A}) = \min\{r : \ \mathcal{A}^{(r)} \neq \emptyset\}$.

Suppose $r_+(\mathcal{A}) \geq \frac{n+2}{3}$. As $\mathcal{A}_0 = \mathcal{A}$ is an antichain, we have that the family

$$\mathcal{A}_1 = \left(\mathcal{A} \setminus \mathcal{A}^{(r_+)}\right) \cup \partial^- \mathcal{A}^{(r_+)}$$

is also an antichain. Now by counting edges between $\partial^- \mathcal{A}^{(r_+)}$ and $\mathcal{A}^{(r_+)}$ in the directed graph $D(P_n)$ we see that

$$\begin{aligned} |\partial^- \mathcal{A}^{(r_+)}| &\geq \frac{r_+}{n - 2r_+ + 2} |\mathcal{A}^{(r_+)}| \\ &\geq |\mathcal{A}^{(r_+)}| && \text{since } r_+ \geq \frac{n+2}{3}. \end{aligned}$$

In particular $|\mathcal{A}_1| \geq |\mathcal{A}_0|$. Repeating this procedure as many times as necessary, we can produce an antichain at least as large as $\mathcal{A}$ with no set of size greater than or equal to $\frac{n+2}{3}$.

In the other direction, suppose $r_-(\mathcal{A}) \leq \frac{n-1}{4}$. As $\mathcal{A}_0 = \mathcal{A}$ is an antichain, we have that the family

$$\mathcal{A}_1 = \left(\mathcal{A} \setminus \mathcal{A}^{(r_-)}\right) \cup \partial^+ \mathcal{A}^{(r_-)}$$

is also an antichain. Counting edges between $\mathcal{A}^{(r_-)}$ and $\partial^+ \mathcal{A}^{(r_-)}$ we have

$$\begin{aligned} |\partial^+ \mathcal{A}^{(r_-)}| &\geq \frac{n - 3r_-}{r_- + 1} |\mathcal{A}^{(r_-)}| \\ &\geq |\mathcal{A}^{(r_-)}| && \text{since } r_- \leq \frac{n-1}{4}. \end{aligned}$$

In particular $|\mathcal{A}_1| \geq |\mathcal{A}_0|$. Repeating this procedure as many times as necessary, we can produce an antichain at least as large as $\mathcal{A}$ with no set of size less than or equal to $\frac{n-1}{4}$.

Now $\frac{n+2}{3} - \frac{n-1}{4} = \frac{n+11}{12}$, thus for $n \geq 2$ there always exists an integer $r : \ \frac{n-1}{4} < r < \frac{n+2}{3}$, so that the upper and lower shifting processes described above don't interfere with each other. So we can obtain from any antichain $\mathcal{A}$ and antichain $\mathcal{A}'$ which is at least as large and which lies in $Q'(P_n)$, as claimed. □

Observe now that for $n = 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 9$ and 10 there is a unique integer r satisfying $\frac{n-1}{4} < r < \frac{n+2}{3}$. Thus Conjecture 4 holds for these n. As we gave a partition of $Q(P_8)$ into chains meeting the largest layer in the previous subsection (and as the case $n = 1$ is trivial), this means Conjecture 4 holds for all $n < 11$.

By Lemma 18, there is an antichain of maximum size in $Q(P_{11})$ which lies entirely inside $Q^{(3)}(P_{11}) \cup Q^{(4)}(P_{11})$. The union of these two layers has size 154, and the largest layer of $Q(P_{11})$ is $Q^{(3)}(P_{11})$ which has size 84. Thus the first open case of our conjecture asks whether we can find an antichain in $Q^{(3)}(P_{11}) \cup Q^{(4)}(P_{11})$ with 85 or more elements. This already does not look amenable to a pure brute force search.

5 Concluding remarks

5.1 The LYM inequality

Sperner's theorem has over time given rise to an entire field, called Sperner Theory. We refer the reader to the monograph of Engel [4] for more details on the subject. We have already briefly discussed two different proofs of Sperner's theorem in the previous section (via a partition into disjoint chains and via shadow arguments) and the reasons why they do not adapt well to the $Q(P_n)$ setting. Let us make a remark here about a third classical approach to Sperner's theorem, via the elegant LYM inequality of Lubell, Yamamoto, Meshalkin and Bollobás [1, 12, 13, 19].

Theorem 19 (LYM inequality). *Let $n \in \mathbb{N}$ and $\mathcal{A} \subseteq Q_n$ be an antichain. Then*

$$\sum_{r=0}^{n} \frac{|\mathcal{A} \cap Q_n^{(r)}|}{|Q_n^{(r)}|} \leq 1.$$

Note that Sperner's theorem is instant from LYM. Unfortunately we have been unable to find a good analogue of the LYM inequality for $Q(P_n)$. Not all maximal chains in $Q(P_n)$ have the same length, nor are elements in a given layer of $Q(P_n)$ contained in the same number of chains. Indeed, even restricting to 'typical' layers and 'typical' elements of those layers does not help us. As for shadows, the out-degrees are insufficiently concentrated for a uniform random chain to prove even an approximate form of Conjecture 4: a divergence in the out-degree by an additive factor of $O(\sqrt{n})$ blows up to a divergence by a constant multiplicative factor in the number of chain-extensions of order $O(\sqrt{n})$. So to adapt the LYM strategy to our $Q(P_n)$ setting, we would need to construct a biased random chain which samples layers in a uniform manner. We could for example associate an 'energy' to sets, which would be high on high out-degree sets, and then give our random chain a slight bias toward lower energy configurations. Though we have been unable to do this, it is probably one of the more promising approaches left open by our investigations.

5.2 Theorem 3 for other G

Observe that our proof of Theorem 3 relied exclusively on the concentration estimates (Corollaries 11 and 13) we were able to obtain for q_n^r and $q_n^{r,d}$. Given any graph sequence $G = G_n$, $n = 1, 2 \ldots$ where $|Q_n^{(r)}(G)|$ and $|Q_n^{(r),d}(G)|$ are similarly concentrated about their means, we can run through our argument to show that

$$s(G_n) \leq C' \max_{0 \leq r \leq n} |Q^{(r)}(G_n)|,$$

where $C' > 1$ is an absolute constant depending only on our choice of sequence $(G_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$.

In particular, $s(C_n)$ is of the same order as the size of the largest layer(s) of $Q(C_n)$, and for any fixed $c > 0$, $s(G_{n,\frac{c}{n}})$ is with high probability at most a constant times the size of the largest layer(s) of $Q(G_{n,\frac{c}{n}})$.

5.3 Other questions

Suppose that for any two consecutive layers of the Fibonacci hypercube we were able to find an injection from the smaller of the two layers into the larger one. Then by stitching these injections together, we would obtain a partition of $Q(P_n)$ into disjoint chains each of which meets the largest layer(s), thus proving Conjecture 4.

One way we might try to find such a family of injections is by checking Hall's condition holds and applying Hall's marriage theorem [6]. Suppose without loss of generality that $r_\star < r$. To find a matching from $Q^{(r)}(P_n)$ into $Q^{(r-1)}(P_n)$ it is then sufficient to show that $|\mathcal{A}| \leq |\partial^- \mathcal{A}|$ for all $\mathcal{A} \subseteq Q^{(r)}(P_n)$. This makes us interested more generally in the following isoperimetric problem:

Problem 7. Let $0 \leq r \leq n$ and let $0 \leq s \leq q_n^r$. Identify the families $\mathcal{A} \subseteq Q^{(r)}(P_n)$ of size s that minimise the size of the lower shadow.

In the usual hypercube, this problem was solved by Kruskal and Katona [10, 11] using shifting techniques that cannot be adapted to $Q(P_n)$ without additional ideas. Talbot [17] has moreover exhibited examples which show that the families minimising the size of the lower shadow are not nested, suggesting the problem may be quite difficult.

6 Acknowledgements

The author would like to thank David Saxton for many stimulating conversations on the problem.

References

[1] B. Bollobás. On generalized graphs. *Acta Mathematica Hungarica*, 16(3):447–452, 1965.

[2] G. Cohen, E. Fachini, and J. Körner. Skewincidence. *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory*, 57(11):7313–7316, 2010.

[3] R.P. Dilworth. A decomposition theorem for partially ordered sets. *The Annals of Mathematics*, 51(1):161–166, 1950.

[4] K. Engel. *Sperner theory.* Cambridge University Press, 1997.

[5] P. Erdős, C. Ko, and R. Rado. Intersection theorems for systems of finite sets. *The Quarterly Journal of Mathematics*, 12(1):313–320, 1961.

[6] M. Hall. Distinct representatives of subsets. *Bull. Amer. Math. Soc*, 54:922–926, 1948.

[7] F.C. Holroyd. Problem 338 (BCC16. 25), Erdős–Ko–Rado at the court of King Arthur. *Discrete Mathematics*, 197(8):812, 1999.

[8] W.J. Hsu. Fibonacci cubes-a new interconnection topology. *IEEE Transactions on Parallel and Distributed Systems*, 4(1):3–12, 1993.

[9] W.J. Hsu, M.J. Chung, and A. Das. Linear recursive networks and their applications in distributed systems. *IEEE Transactions on Parallel and Distributed Systems*, 8(7): 673–680, 1997.

[10] G. Katona. A theorem of finite sets. *Classic Papers in Combinatorics*, pages 381–401, 1987.

[11] J.B. Kruskal. The number of simplices in a complex. *Mathematical optimization techniques*, page 251, 1963.

[12] D. Lubell. A short proof of Sperner's lemma. *Classic Papers in Combinatorics*, pages 402–402, 1987.

[13] L.D. Meshalkin. Generalization of Sperner's theorem on the number of subsets of a finite set. *Theory of Probability and its Applications*, 8:203, 1963.

[14] A. Schrijver. Vertex-critical subgraphs of Kneser graphs. *Nieuw archief voor wiskunde*, 26:454, 1978.

[15] E. Sperner. Ein Satz über Untermengen einer endlichen Menge (in German). *Mathematische Zeitschrift*, 27(1):544–548, 1928.

[16] I. Stojmenovic. Optimal deadlock-free routing and broadcasting on Fibonacci cube networks. *Utilitas Mathematica*, pages 159–166, 1998.

[17] J. Talbot. *Lagrangians of Hypergraphs and Other Combinatorial Results.* PhD thesis, University College London, 2001.

[18] J. Talbot. Intersecting families of separated sets. *Journal of the London Mathematical Society*, 68(1):37–51, 2003.

[19] K. Yamamoto. Logarithmic order of free distributive lattice. *Journal of the Mathematical Society of Japan*, 6(3-4):343–353, 1954.